



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,758	03/05/2007	Hiromichi Inaishi	1794-0182PUS1	5126

2292 7590 12/12/2008
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

ALHIJA, SAIF A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2128

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

12/12/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/575,758	Applicant(s) INAISHI ET AL.	
	Examiner SAIF A. ALHIJA	Art Unit 2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25,26,28-36 and 42-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25,26,28-36 and 42-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2128

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 25-26, 28-36, and 42-46 have been presented for examination.

Claims 1-24 have been cancelled in a preliminary amendment.

Claims 27 and 37-41 are newly cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 16 September 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

NON-PRIOR ART ARGUMENTS

i) With respect to the 101 rejections see below.

ii) The 112 2nd rejections are withdrawn in view of Applicants arguments and amendments.

PRIOR ART ARGUMENTS

iii) Applicants argue that the reference does not teach **“displaying design instruction information corresponding to a circuit diagram.”** The Examiner notes that Figures 4 and 5 show design information in graphical form including power analysis of a circuit. Figure 5 further recites that a user can click on any component or part and information is brought up graphically pertaining to the part. Applicants have not explained how the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed limitation is not read on by the displaying of part information and power analysis of a circuit design.

iv) Applicants argue that the reference **“does not automatically display technical information in which keywords corresponding to the type of items included in the circuit diagram are associated with design instruction information as set forth in claim 25.”** First the Examiner notes that this recitation does not appear in claim 25, specifically the term automatically. However assuming that Applicants intend a portion of the specification to include this feature following invocation of 112 6th paragraph the Examiner notes that recitation in Figure 5 that a user can click on any component or part and information is brought up graphically pertaining to the part represents the automatic display of information as well as keywords. The recitation on page 48 of Geppert further discloses the use of keywords in the knowledge base pertaining to parts.

v) Applicants argue that the reference does not teach the limitation of claim 26 specifically **“wherein said displaying means displays keywords corresponding to the type of items included in the read circuit diagram when the circuit diagram is read by said reading means.”** The Examiner notes that following the

Art Unit: 2128

broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed limitation the use of key words in Geppert reads on the limitation presented. Specifically this argued limitation is broad enough to encompass the mere displaying of a keyword associated with a circuit diagram. This is seen in the diagram of Figure 5.

vi) Applicants argue **"In short, Geppert does not give description or suggestion that technical information corresponding to a circuit diagram is displayed automatically and in an easily understandable manner visually by associating the items with the design instruction information as set forth in claim 32."** The

Examiner notes that Applicants have not shown that the recitation in Figure 5 that a user can click on any component or part and information is brought up graphically pertaining to the part is neither easily understandable nor displayed automatically. It is unclear if Applicants intend these phrases to bear initial meaning which is not presented in the claim language. The Examiner respectfully reminds Applicants that the claims must be interpreted in their broadest most reasonable form and as such the rejection is maintained.

vii) Applicants argue that the highlighting of all corresponding keywords by the highlighting of a respective keyword is not possible with Geppert. However as per the Examiners motivation statement in the previous office action it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to highlight items that were of importance to design/verification/etc. This is seen in Geppert on Page 49, left middle, which recites **"It is a cross-platform software suite for collaborative design on the Web, so that teams with members anywhere in the world may manage the design and configuration data associated with complex application-specific IC and custom chips."** The Examiner further notes that the highlighting feature argued by Applicants is not novel and in view of KSR, 550 U.S.at ___, 82 USPQ2d at 1391 which reads **"The Supreme Court further stated that: When a work is available in one field of endeavor, design incentives and other market forces can prompt variations of it, either in the same field or a different one. If a person of ordinary skill can implement a predictable variation, § 103 likely bars its patentability. For the same reason, if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond his or her skill. Id. at ___, 82 USPQ2d at 1396."** (Emphasis added) The Examiner cannot see how a person of ordinary skill in the art would lack the skill to utilize highlighting in the manner recited by Applicants nor

Art Unit: 2128

can the Examiner see how the resultant of the claims would be beyond the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore the rejections are maintained.

viii) Applicants argue that the **“accepting an authorization”** recited in the claims differs from the **“authentication”** recited in the reference. The Examiner notes first that Applicants have not explained how these phrases are different in the context of the broadest most reasonable interpretation of the claimed invention. Second the Examiner notes that the accepting an authorization to accept input is read on by the authorization recited in the reference. Applicants are encouraged to either specifically differentiate the functional and patentable distinctions between the claimed limitations and the reference or further define the claim language in light of what Applicants view as a difference in functionality. In present form the claim rejections are maintained.

ix) Since no additional arguments were made regarding the Geppert in view of Kundert rejections they are also **MAINTAINED**.

x) In response to this office action Applicants are respectfully encouraged to map each means for limitation to a relevant portion of the specification as per 112 6th paragraph. Applicants are further respectfully requested to direct their arguments against the prior art of record by using the relevant cited sections of the specification in view of 112 6th paragraph to expedite prosecution of the instant application.

EXAMINERS NOTES

xi) Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

xii) The Examiner respectfully requests, in the event the Applicants choose to amend or add new claims, that such claims and their limitations be directly mapped to the specification, which provides support for the subject matter. This will assist in expediting compact prosecution.

xiii) Further, the Examiner respectfully encourages Applicants to direct the specificity of their response with regards to this office action to the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims as presented. This will avoid

Art Unit: 2128

issues that would delay prosecution such as limitations not explicitly presented in the claims, intended use statements that carry no patentable weight, mere allegations of patentability, and novelty that is not clearly expressed.

xiv) The Examiner also respectfully requests Applicants, in the event they choose to amend, to supply a clean version of the presented claims in addition to the marked-up copy in order to avoid potential inaccuracies with the version of the claims that would be examined.

PRIORITY

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

MPEP 2106 recites:

The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result" State Street 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. A process that consists solely of the manipulation of an abstract idea is not concrete or tangibles. See In re Warmerdam, 33 F.3d 1354, 1360, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1759 (Fed.Cir. 1994). See also Schrader, 22 F.3d at 295, 30 USPQ2d at 1459.

4. **Claims 25-26, 28-36, and 42-46 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

i) The Courts have found that subject matter that is not a practical application or use of an idea, a law of nature or a natural phenomenon is not patentable. As the Supreme Court has made clear, "[a]n idea of itself is not patentable," Rubber-Tip Pencil Co. v. Howard, 20 U.S. (7 Wall.) 498, 507 (1874); taking several abstract ideas and manipulating them together adds nothing to the basic equation. In re Warmerdam, 31 USPQ2d 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Art Unit: 2128

Further as per *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 71-72, 175 USPQ 673, 676 (1972) the claims must result in a physical transformation or provide a “particular machine” for execution. The claims as presented merely deal with graphical depiction of circuit information which results neither in a physical transformation nor requires a “particular machine” for execution. As such the 101 rejections are maintained.

Appropriate correction is required.

All claims dependent upon a rejected base claim are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 25-26, 32, 36, 42, and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by **Geppert, “IC Design on the World Wide Web”, hereafter Geppert.**

Regarding Claim 25:

The reference discloses A printed circuit board design instruction support device that supports printed circuit board design between a circuit design and a printed circuit board design, said device comprising:

means for reading a circuit diagram designed by the circuit design; **(Geppert, Page 46, Figure 1, circuit CAD)**

Art Unit: 2128

means for storing design instruction information regarding the printed circuit board design and keywords, which are associated with said design instruction information and set corresponding to the type of items included in said circuit diagram; and **(Geppert. Page 46, Figure 1, circuit CAD. Figure 4, power analysis of circuit)**

means for extracting keywords corresponding to the type of items included in the read circuit diagram and displaying design instruction information associated with the extracted keywords, when the circuit diagram is read by said reading means. **(Geppert. Figure 5 component key words)**

Regarding Claim 26:

The reference discloses The printed circuit board design instruction support device according to claim 25, wherein said displaying means displays keywords corresponding to the type of items included in the read circuit diagram when the circuit diagram is read by said reading means. **(Geppert. Page 48, bottom right, “including searches by key word.”)**

Regarding Claim 32:

The reference discloses The printed circuit board design instruction support device according to claim 26, said device comprising:

means for extracting items included in the circuit diagram read by said reading means; and **(Geppert. Page 46, Figure 1, circuit CAD. Figure 4, power analysis of circuit)**

means for associating items that were extracted by said extraction means with said design instruction information via said keywords, wherein **(Geppert. Figure 5 component key words)**

said display means displays the items associated by said association means. **(Geppert. Page 48, bottom right, “One of the most successful Web sites for design information is maintained by National Semiconductor Corp., Santa Clara, Calif. Visitors to the company's site have access to its complete portfolio of more than 27 000 parts-the equivalent of more than 40 000 pages of technical information.”)**

Regarding Claim 36:

Art Unit: 2128

The reference discloses The printed circuit board design instruction support device according to any one of claims 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34, said device comprising:

means for managing whether or not a printed circuit board design was performed according to said design instruction information, by accepting the input of a result in which said design instruction information was reflected on the printed circuit board design and accepting an authorization to said result. **(Geppert. Figure 1, verification)**

Regarding Claim 42:

The reference discloses A program for allowing a computer to function as the printed circuit board design instruction support device according to any one of claims 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34. **(Geppert. Page 47, left bottom, client/server)**

Regarding Claim 44:

The reference discloses A printed circuit board design instruction support method in which printed circuit board design is supported between a circuit design and a printed circuit board design, said method comprising the step of:

reading a circuit diagram designed by the circuit design; **(Geppert. Page 46, Figure 1, circuit CAD)**

storing design instruction information regarding the printed circuit board design and keywords, which are associated with said design instruction information and set corresponding to the type of items included in said circuit diagram; and **(Geppert. Page 46, Figure 1, circuit CAD. Figure 4, power analysis of circuit)**

extracting keywords corresponding to the type of items included in the read circuit design and displaying design instruction information associated with the extracted keywords, when the circuit design is read by said reading means. **(Geppert. Figure 5 component key words)**

Regarding Claim 45:

The reference discloses A program for allowing a computer to function as the printed circuit board design instruction support device according to claim 44. **(Geppert. Page 47, left bottom, client/server)**

Art Unit: 2128

Regarding Claim 46:

The reference discloses A computer-readable recording medium recording the program according to claim 42. **(Geppert. Page 47, left bottom, client/server)**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claim(s) 33-35 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Geppert**.

Regarding Claim 33:

Geppert does not explicitly recite the term “highlighting” with respect to the claims recitation of The printed circuit board design instruction support device according to claim 32, wherein

said reading means reads a printed circuit board diagram designed by the printed circuit board design, said device comprising:

Art Unit: 2128

means for selecting items or keywords displayed by said display means; and means for highlighting items on the printed circuit board diagram read by said reading means, which correspond to items selected by said selection means, when the items are selected by said selection means, and highlighting items associated with the keywords on said printed circuit board diagram read by said reading means, which corresponds to keywords selected by said selection means, when keywords are selected by said selection means.

However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to highlight items that were of importance to design/verification/etc. This is seen in Geppert on Page 49, left middle, which recites “It is a cross-platform software suite for collaborative design on the Web, so that teams with members anywhere in the world may manage the design and configuration data associated with complex application-specific IC and custom chips.”

Regarding Claim 34:

Geppert does not explicitly recite the term “highlighting” with respect to the claims recitation of The printed circuit board design instruction support device according to claim 32, said device comprising:

means for selecting items or keywords displayed by said display means; and means for highlighting items on said circuit diagram read by said reading means, which correspond to items selected by said selection means, when the items are selected by said selection means, and highlighting items associated with keywords on said circuit diagram read by said reading means, which correspond to keywords selected by said selection means, when the keywords are selected by said selection means.

However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to highlight items that were of importance to design/verification/etc. This is seen in Geppert on Page 49, left middle, which recites “It is a cross-platform software suite for collaborative design on the Web, so that teams with members anywhere in the world may manage the design and configuration data associated with complex application-specific IC and custom chips.”

Regarding Claim 35:

Art Unit: 2128

Geppert does not explicitly recite the term “highlighting” with respect to the claims recitation of The printed circuit board design instruction support device according to any one of claims 33 and 34, said device comprising:

means for executing macro that performs control such that said display means displays the entire circuit diagram read by said reading means before items are highlighted by said highlight means, macro that performs control such that said display means displays highlighted items in an enlarged manner after the items were highlighted by said highlight means, or macro that performs control such that said display means displays the entire circuit diagram read by said reading means before items are highlighted by said highlight means and said display means displays highlighted items in an enlarged manner after the items were highlighted by said highlight means.

However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to highlight items that were of importance to design/verification/etc. This is seen in Geppert on Page 49, left middle, which recites “It is a cross-platform software suite for collaborative design on the Web, so that teams with members anywhere in the world may manage the design and configuration data associated with complex application-specific IC and custom chips.” See also Figure 1 of Geppert with respect to verification.

Regarding Claim 43:

The reference discloses A program for allowing a computer to function as the printed circuit board design instruction support device according to claim 35. **(Geppert. Page 47, left bottom, client/server)**

7. **Claim(s) 28-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Geppert** in view of **Kundert, “Power Supply Noise Reduction”, hereafter Kundert.**

Regarding Claim 28:

Geppert does not explicitly disclose The printed circuit board design instruction support device according to claim 25, said device comprising:

means for extracting damping resistances and target ICs of the resistances from the circuit diagram read said reading means, by extracting resistances, which have an attribute of series connection, from the circuit diagram

Art Unit: 2128

read by said reading means and discriminating whether or not items connected to the pins of the extracted resistances are Ics.

However Kundert discloses means for extracting damping resistances and target Ics of the resistances from the circuit diagram read said reading means, by extracting resistances, which have an attribute of series connection, from the circuit diagram read by said reading means and discriminating whether or not items connected to the pins of the extracted resistances are Ics. **(Kundert. Figure 8)**

Geppert and Kundert are analogous art in circuit design.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for the design of a damping resistance in the IC and its corresponding wiring information as per **Kundert** with the web based design of IC's in **Geppert** since damping resistors are a well known and common way to reduce ringing and noise peaking in integrated circuit designs. **(Kundert, Section 6)**

Regarding Claim 29:

Geppert does not explicitly disclose The printed circuit board design instruction support device according to claim 25, said device comprising:

means for extracting bypass capacitors and target Ics of the capacitors from the circuit diagram read by said reading means, by extracting capacitors, which are connected to a power source and ground, from the circuit diagram read by said reading means and discriminating whether or not the extracted capacitors are capacitors connected to IC toward the power source side.

However Kundert discloses means for extracting bypass capacitors and target Ics of the capacitors from the circuit diagram read by said reading means, by extracting capacitors, which are connected to a power source and ground, from the circuit diagram read by said reading means and discriminating whether or not the extracted capacitors are capacitors connected to IC toward the power source side. **(Kundert. Figure 8)**

Geppert and Kundert are analogous art in circuit design.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for the design of a bypass capacitor in the IC and its corresponding wiring information as per **Kundert** with the web based

Art Unit: 2128

design of IC's in **Geppert** since bypass capacitors are a well known and common way to reduce output impedance in integrated circuit designs. (See **Kundert, Page 5, last paragraph**)

Regarding Claim 30:

Geppert does not explicitly disclose The printed circuit board design instruction support device according to claim 29, wherein

said extraction means when the extracted capacitors are connected to a plurality of Ics, extracts an IC having the shortest connecting distance out of the Ics.

However Kundert discloses said extraction means when the extracted capacitors are connected to a plurality of Ics, extracts an IC having the shortest connecting distance out of the Ics. (**Kundert, Figure 8**)

Geppert and Kundert are analogous art in circuit design.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for the design of a bypass capacitor in the IC and its corresponding wiring information as per **Kundert** with the web based design of IC's in **Geppert** since bypass capacitors are a well known and common way to reduce output impedance in integrated circuit designs. (See **Kundert, Page 5, last paragraph**)

Regarding Claim 31:

Geppert does not explicitly disclose The printed circuit board design instruction support device according to claim 29, wherein said extraction means extracts the bypass capacitors, the target Ics of the capacitors, and the information of wiring connecting the both parts from the circuit diagram read by said reading means.

However Kundert discloses The printed circuit board design instruction support device according to claim 29, wherein said extraction means extracts the bypass capacitors, the target Ics of the capacitors, and the information of wiring connecting the both parts from the circuit diagram read by said reading means. (**Kundert, Figure 8**)

Geppert and Kundert are analogous art in circuit design.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for the design of a bypass capacitor in the IC and its corresponding wiring information as per **Kundert** with the web based

Art Unit: 2128

design of IC's in **Geppert** since bypass capacitors are a well known and common way to reduce output impedance in integrated circuit designs. (See **Kundert, Page 5, last paragraph**)

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. All Claims are rejected.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SAIF A. ALHIJA whose telephone number is (571)272-8635. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 11:00-7:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah can be reached on (571) 272-22792279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. *Informal or draft communication, please label PROPOSED or DRAFT*, can be additionally sent to the Examiners fax phone number, (571) 273-8635.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2128

SAA

/Kamini S Shah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2128

December 4, 2008